



Muscovites gathered around a display outside a newspaper office to read accounts of the meeting of the Soviet Communist Party leadership. Reuters

Excerpts From Remarks by Soviet Ambassador

Special to The New York Times

MOSCOW, Feb. 7 — Following are excerpts from remarks by Vladimir I. Brovikov, Soviet Ambassador to Poland, at the meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Tuesday, as distributed by Tass, the official Soviet press agency, and translated by The New York Times:

I share the opinion of those who spoke before me who said that the document being discussed by us is hardly acceptable in the form presented to us and needs to be seriously revised. Its excessive slogan mongering and even somewhat shrill tone, the inaccuracy of the assessments of the past and especially of the present contained in it, ideological eclecticism and lack of theoretical clarity do not as yet allow it to claim the role of the program document of our party. The impression is created that the document has a utilitarian function and is intended to satisfy the immediate requirements of our policy.

In the platform there is much extolling of perestroika and criticism of the distant past and plenty of generous promises about the future, but there is barely any assessment of the present and of the mistakes committed not at some time in the past but during the period of perestroika.

In recent times we have somehow begun to value not our own assessments of our work but those of gentlemen in the West.

The heck with them. Bush is Bush, and the people are the people. We somehow are trying to prove that the people are for perestroika, but permit me to ask, for what kind? Not for the kind which in almost five years has thrown the country into the vortex of crisis and led it to the line where we have come face to face with an orgy of anarchy and the breakdown of the economy, with the grimace of all-out collapse and the decline of morals. To assert in this situation that the people are for, that everything pleases them, is at a minimum politically dishonest.

Discipline and Democracy

The people are against and are speaking out about this increasingly vocally. Comrades, you know this very well, there's no need for me to tell you.

It is for this reason, apparently, that for our leadership it is more pleasant to meet with smiling crowds on the streets of Western capitals than with our own despondent countrymen who might, in keeping with the laws of glasnost, say something unpleasant.

Was it not a mistake to proclaim the total democratization of society and forget about the other side of the coin — the establishment of order and discipline in the country?

Anyone who is in the least bit familiar with theory and politics knows that discipline without democracy will survive, but democracy without discipline is inconceivable, for it inevitably grows into sociopolitical chaos.

This point is well understood by the Western leaders who so fervently praise us. At home they act brutally and decisively when even the slightest threat emerges to their state or class interests. And in doing so, Bush and Thatcher don't pay attention to what others think of them. Panama, the suppression of the strike movement in England and much, much more provide illustration of this.

Laws and Mistakes

Comrades, was not the enactment of hasty, inadequately considered laws a mistake? To some people it seemed that everything was all right, and they immediately praised the new drafts. But then it turned out that they were not all right, and, as a matter of fact, quite the opposite.

That's the way it was, for instance,

with the anti-alcohol legislation. At the time we said that it would be once and for all, and now our foreign-trade officials are scouring the entire world to buy hundreds of thousands of decaliters of vodka for the overly sober Soviet consumer.

We are still running around looking for panaceas for all evils and hoping that democracy, which we have turned into an absolute, will put everything in its place in the political sphere and the market will set things straight in the economic sphere. But since everything has turned out just the opposite, it is not the leaders in the center who are to blame, you see, but local officials. Or the excuse is made that they didn't think it would turn out like this. Putting it frankly, this is a strange position for such high-ranking officials.

But more than anything else, it has become fashionable to blame all our disasters on the "accursed past."

I believe that all our tragedy today stems from our not being able as before to move away from one-man rule in the Government and the party. We often conduct matters instinctively, incompetently and without looking into the future, worrying less about the welfare of the country than about personal ambitions.